

PUBLIC HEARING--May 12, 1965

Appeal #8178 M. Rahim Moezie, appellant.

The Zoning Administrator District of Columbia, appellee.

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried the following Order was entered on May 17, 1965:

**ORDERED:**

That the appeal for a variance from the rear and side yard requirements of the R-2 District to permit two-story addition to existing dwelling at 3113 Quebec Place, N.W., lot 828, square 2062, be granted.

From the records and the evidence adduced at the hearing, the Board finds the following facts:

(1) Appellant's lot, which is located in the R-2 District, is improved with a detached dwelling. The lot has a frontage of 84.64 feet on Quebec Place, 99.58 feet on the north, 101.90 feet on the south and narrows down to 4.76 feet at the rear. The lot is "pie-shaped" and contains an area of 4458 square feet.

(2) Appellant proposes to erect a two-story rear addition 14' x 10' to be used as a bedroom. This will be a second story addition over an existing porch. He will provide a side yard to the north of 4.74 feet and 8 feet to the south opposite the addition. The building as presently located has only 4.14' side yard on the north boundary.

(3) Due to the shape of the lot which narrows down to 4.76 feet at the rear appellant can only provide a rear yard of 18 feet whereas 20 feet is required by the Zoning Regulations.

(4) There was no objection to the granting of this appeal registered at the public hearing.

**OPINION:**

The Board is of the opinion that appellant has proven a case of hardship within the provisions of Section 8207.11 due to the shape of the lot in question which is "pie-shaped" and narrows down to only 4.76 feet at the rear. Although appellant's rear yard is only 18 feet measured from the rear of the center of the addition to the side yard, due to the shape of the lot the rear yard actually extends back approximately 26 feet.

The Board is further of the opinion that light and air to adjoining properties will not be affected adversely as the addition is well removed from any adjoining properties.

In view of the above condition and situation of the property in question it is our opinion that this relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent, purpose and integrity of the zone plan as embodied in the zoning regulations and map.